

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

TARIQ JABRI,

Plaintiff,

v.

BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 24-9197 (SDW) (JSA)

WHEREAS OPINION

April 22, 2025

WIGENTON, District Judge.

THIS MATTER having come before this Court upon pro se Plaintiff Tariq Jabri's motion for reconsideration (D.E. 39 ("Motion")) filed on March 5, 2025, and seemingly supplemented by filings on March 20, 2025 (D.E. 41), April 4, 2025 (D.E. 43), and April 7, 2025 (D.E. 44), and this Court having reviewed Plaintiff's submissions and Defendant Bank of America, N.A.'s opposition filed on March 24, 2025 (D.E. 42); and

WHEREAS Plaintiff seeks reconsideration of this Court's March 3, 2025 opinion (D.E. 37) and order (D.E. 38) granting Defendant's motion to dismiss the complaint pursuant to the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine; and

WHEREAS a party moving for reconsideration must show "(1) an intervening change in the controlling law; (2) the availability of new evidence that was not available when the court [reached its original decision]; or (3) the need to correct a clear error of law or fact or to prevent manifest injustice," *Blystone v. Horn*, 664 F.3d 397, 415 (3d Cir. 2011) (quotation marks and

italics omitted). Its brief must “set[] forth concisely the matter or controlling decisions which the party believes the Judge has overlooked,” L. Civ. R. 7.1(i); and

WHEREAS Plaintiff here has not met these requirements. To the extent it is comprehensible, Plaintiff’s Motion identifies one decision from the Supreme Court of Michigan and another from the United States Supreme Court. (D.E. 39 at 1–2.) Plaintiff does not explain how either has any bearing on this Court’s dismissal of the complaint on *Rooker-Feldman* grounds. (*Id.*) Otherwise, Plaintiff’s filings appear to be a request for information (D.E. 43) and a complaint form he filed with what appears to be a state entity (D.E. 44). The Motion identifies no changes in law, new evidence, or error in need of correction; therefore

Plaintiff’s Motion is **DENIED**. An appropriate order follows.

/s/ Susan D. Wigenton
SUSAN D. WIGENTON, U.S.D.J.

Orig: Clerk
cc: Parties
Jessica S. Allen, U.S.M.J.